Application No. 09/996,681

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully considered the rejections of the Examiner in the present application. In light of this consideration, Applicants believe that the claims, as amended, are allowable. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of the claims now pending in the application.

In the first Office Action of January 2, 2004, claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,117,347, to Ishida (hereinafter Ishida). Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,302,554, to Kashiwa et al. (hereinafter Kashiwa). Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishida in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,726,879, to Bondur et al. (hereinafter Bondur). Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishida in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,184,570, to MacDonald, Jr. et al. (hereinafter MacDonald). Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishida in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,363,201, to Sherrer, et al. (hereinafter Sherrer). Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kashiwa in view of Bondur. Claims 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kashiwa in view of Sherrer. Claims 10-20 were indicated as allowed.

In this second Office Action of June 9, 2004, claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,117,347, to Cronin et al. (hereinafter Cronin). Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cronin in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,726,879, to Bondur et al. (hereinafter Bondur). Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cronin in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,184,570, to MacDonald, Jr. et al. (hereinafter MacDonald). Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35

Application No. 09/996,681

U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cronin in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,363,201, to Sherrer, et al. (hereinafter Sherrer).

Claims 10-20 were previously indicated as allowed. Claims 21-26 have now been indicated as allowed as well. The Applicants' wish to express their appreciation to the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter. Independent claim 1 has been amended and is believed to now overcome the cited reference.

Cronin provides for the etching of double trenches. Sawing is then performed along a path disposed that is *parallel to* and *between* the double trenches (column 12 lines 20-21). This is in contrast to the amended claim 1 which provides "sawing the semiconductor wafer along the U-groove where one edge of the saw is both substantially in alignment with the bottom of the U-groove and substantially coextensive with the bottom of said U-groove". Furthermore the trenches taught by the Cronin reference are not U-groove shaped but are deep well trenches, and as is well understood by those skilled in the art, have nearly perpendicular sides. Allowance of claims 1 and 3 is respectfully requested. Claims 2, 4-6, and 7-9, depend from a claim now believed to be allowable and should now be allowable as well. Allowance of claims 2, 4-6, and 7-9, is respectfully requested.

No additional fee is believed to be required for this amendment; however, the undersigned Xerox Corporation attorney authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025.

Application No. 09/996,681

It is respectfully submitted that the present set of claims, as amended, are patentably distinct over the cited references. In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he is hereby requested to call the undersigned attorney at (585) 423-6918, Rochester, NY.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher D. Wait Attorney for Applicant(s) Registration No. 43,230 Telephone (585) 423-6918

September 9, 2004 CDW/fsl Xerox Corporation Xerox Square 20A Rochester, New York 14644